

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

**REMARKS**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 18 2007

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for his findings and conclusions.
2. It should be appreciated that Applicant has elected to amend Claims 1, 14, 16, 17, and 23 solely for the purpose of expediting the patent process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (9/8/00). In making such amendments, Applicant has not and does not in any way narrow the scope of protection to which the Applicant considers the invention herein entitled. Rather, Applicant reserves Applicant's right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seeks to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

**Hilton Davis / Festo Statement**

The amendments herein to Claim 14, 16, and 17 were not made for any reason related to patentability. Claims 14, 16, and 17 were amended to clarify the invention and to conform with standard claim drafting practices. All of the above listed amendments were made for reasons other than patentability.

3. Claims 1-4, 23-26, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 7,080,139 (hereinafter "Briggs") in view of U.S. patent no. 6,839,690 (hereinafter "Liu").

**Claims 1-4**

The Applicant amends Claim 1 to overcome the cited art and to clarify the invention by further requiring that the user's personal browser history is displayed on a screen simultaneously having links to all of: a personalized Web favorites list, a time-based history, and a category based hierarchy. Support for the

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

amendment is found in the application as filed at least within Figures 3 and 4 and at page 3, lines 11-24. The cited art may teach classifying URL's into a category based hierarchy. However, the cited art does not teach or describe displaying a user's personal browser history in a screen display that simultaneously displays links to the user's personal browser history as sorted through all of a personalized Web favorites list, a time-based history, and a category based hierarchy. Hence, the cited art does not teach all of the required elements of amended Claim 1. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briggs in view of Liu is deemed to be overcome.

#### Claims 23-26

The Applicant amends Claim 23 to overcome the cited art and to clarify the invention by further requiring that the means for using metadata is used to establish a new category using the metadata of the user visited URLs. Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least within the first line of the Abstract at page 12, lines 4-5. The cited art does not teach or describe establishing a new category using the metadata of the user visited URLs. At best, Liu at column 18, lines 16-25 teaches using the categorizer to match the web page against existing categories. Hence, the cited art does not teach all of the required elements of amended Claim 23. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 23 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briggs in view of Liu is deemed to be overcome.

#### Claim 45

As to Claim 45, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 45 contains a required claim element of, emphasis added: "using meta data thus obtained to present a personalized Web favorites list in a category based hierarchy". The Examiner cites Briggs at column 12, line 66 to column 13, line 2; Briggs at

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

column 2, lines 60-67, and Liu at column 18, lines 16-18 against Claims 1, 23, and 45. The Examiner goes on to explain how the cited sections relate to the Claim 1 and 23 requirements. However, the Examiner does not relate the cited art to the Claim 45 requirement of "a personalized Web favorites list". Under MPEP 706 it is stated that "the goal of examination is to clearly articulate any rejection early in the prosecution process so that the applicant has the opportunity to provide evidence of patentability and otherwise reply completely at the earliest opportunity." Particularly, the Examiner relates the cited art to the user's personal browser history requirement of Claims 1 and 23, but is silent of the Claim 45 requirement of a personalized Web favorites list. A personalized Web favorites list is distinct from a user's personal browser history. The Applicant can find no teaching in the cited sections that teach or describe a personalized Web favorites list. Further, the Applicant can find no teachings or suggestion within any of the cited art as using meta data to present the personalized Web favorites list or to present the personalized Web favorites list in a category based hierarchy. Hence, not all of the Claim 45 requirements are taught or described in the cited art. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briggs in view of Liu is deemed to be improper.

4. Claims 5-17 and 27-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 5,761,436 (hereinafter "Nielsen") in view of Liu.

#### Claims 5 and 27

As to independent Claims 5 and 27, the Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least two reasons. Claims 5 and 27 establish a Web browsing history by categorizing URLs. If the URL does not fall into a category, a less specific part of the URL is used to determine a category. For example, the application as filed at page 4, lines 16-19 teaches: "For instance, if no category is found for

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

http://www.cnn.com/stories/entertainment/12345.html, then the system searches for a category for http://www.cnn.com/stories/entertainment and, if that fails, then http://www.cnn.com/stories, and so on.” Thus, as taught in the sentence preceding the above quote at page 4, lines 14-16: “the system iteratively retries the reverse lookup using a less specific part of the URL until a category is found”. The Claim 5 and 27 requirements mirror this. Specifically, Claim 5 and 27 requirements include (1) “performing a reverse lookup in a database to find a chain of categories for a URL” and for URLs for which there is no category in the database (2) “iteratively retrying said reverse lookup using a less specific part of said URL until a category is found”. Thus, Claims 5 and 27 require categorizing based upon the URL and if no category is found AND iteratively retrying, using a less specific part of the URL, the reverse lookup until a category is found. In stark contrast to the Claim 5 and 27 requirements of categorizing and iteratively categorizing, Nielsen teaches storing instead of categorizing and is silent on the iteratively requirements. These two differences between Claims 5 and 27 and Nielsen are further parsed. First, the Examiner cites Nielsen at Figure 4 and column 7, lines 1-15 as teaching categorizing. In the cited section Nielsen teaches storing hyperlink information in a history list array, thereby allowing a user to backtrack to previously visited pages through the hyperlink. Here, Nielsen’s storing or backtracking by a user via a stored URL starkly contrasts the Claim 5 and 27 requirements of performing a reverse lookup to establish a category for a Web browsing history. Second, the cited section of Nielsen goes on to teach a “Link to Next” field showing how the user moves from URL to URL. However, even if the “Link to Next” was used to backtrack a user’s browsing path, nothing indicates that for a specific URL reached by the user that Nielsen teaches or suggests iteratively retrying a reverse lookup using a less specific part of the URL. For example, if a user went from a first URL of http://www.yahoo.com to a second URL of http://www.cnn.com/stories/entertainment/12345.html, then Nielsen would have a pointer from the second URL to the first URL, but would not categorize the second URL in terms of http://www.cnn.com/stories/entertainment or if a

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

category is not found iteratively categorize the second link through <http://www.cnn.com/stories> and further iteratively categorize through then <http://www.cnn.com>. Hence, Nielsen does not teach or suggest categorizing nor does Nielsen teach or suggest any form of iteratively retrying a reverse lookup based upon a less specific part of the URL. Accordingly, the current rejection of independent Claims 5 and 27 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Liu is deemed to be improper.

#### Claim 16

The Applicant amends Claim 16 to clarify the invention by further requiring that the previously visited pages comprise pages previously visited by a user of said user interface. Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least at page 5, lines 6-9. Accordingly, the current rejection of Claim 16 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Liu is deemed to be overcome.

#### Claim 17

The Applicant amends Claim 17 to clarify the invention by further requiring that, within one interface, that the user can focus on pages previously visited by the user and navigate to a wider view of similar pages. Support for the amendment is found in the application as filed at least at page 5, lines 11-19. Nielsen and Liu do not combine to teach a single interface allowing a user to see pages previously viewed by that user and to navigate to a wider view of similar pages, such as those categorized by the Open Directory Project. Accordingly, the current rejection of amended Claim 17 and all claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Liu is deemed to be overcome.

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480

5. Claims 18-22 and 40-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Briggs.

In view of the above described amendments to parent Claims 5 and 27, the current rejection of dependent Claims 18-22 and 40-44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu in view of Briggs is rendered moot.

6. The Applicant amends Claim 14 to correct a grammatical error according to standard claim drafting practices.

U.S. patent application no. 10/826,480


RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 18 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, the Application is deemed to be in allowable condition. The Examiner is therefore earnestly requested to withdraw all outstanding rejections, allowing the Application to pass to issue as a United States Patent. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's attorney at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Glenn

Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862